

The Effect of Individual's
Technological Belief and Usage on
their Absorptive Capacity towards their
Learning Behaviour in the Learning
Environment

The Effect of Individual's Technological Belief and Usage on their Absorptive Capacity towards their Learning Behaviour in the Learning Environment

by Thomas Dolmark

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

Masters by Research

under the supervision of Dr Osama Sohaib and Professor
Ghassan Beydoun

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and IT

July 2020

Certificate of Original Authorship

I, Thomas Dolmark declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Masters by Research, in the Information System Modelling School at the Faculty of Engineering and IT at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:

Signature: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 21/09/20

Table of Content

Acknowledgement.....	VIII
List of Publications	IX
Conference Paper	IX
Working Papers.....	IX
List of Abbreviations.....	X
Abstract	XI
List of Tables.....	XIII
List of Figures	XIV
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	1
1.2 Research Questions	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study	3
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Thesis Outline	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	6
2.1 Explaining Knowledge.....	6
2.2 Managing Knowledge.....	7
2.3 Barriers to Knowledge Transfer in Organisations	8
2.4 Absorptive Capacity.....	9
2.5 The Benefits of Technology in Learning.....	13
2.6 Technology Readiness Index	14
2.7 Technology Readiness Persona.....	15
2.8 Tools for Knowledge Sources.....	16
2.8.1 Benefits of Tools for Knowledge Sources	17
2.8.2 The Failing of Tools for Knowledge Sources.....	17
2.8.3 Organisational Responsibility	18
2.8.4 Conclusion	18
2.9 Social Influences.....	19
2.10 Social Networks	20
2.10.1 What is a Social Network.....	20
2.10.2 Social Networks in Education.....	21
2.10.3 Conclusion	21
2.11 Beliefs Affects Learning Behaviour	21
2.11.1 Individual Work Performance.....	22

2.11.2	Conclusion	23
2.12	Chapter Summary	23
Chapter 3:	Theoretical Background and Research Model	25
3.1	Theoretical Foundation and Research Model	25
3.1.1	Research Model.....	27
3.2	Hypothesis Development	27
3.2.1	From TRI on ACAP	27
3.2.2	TKS on ACAP	29
3.2.3	SI on ACAP	29
3.2.4	SN on ACAP	29
3.2.5	ACAP to Learning Behaviour.....	30
3.3	Chapter Summary	30
Chapter 4:	Research Methodology.....	31
4.1	Research Design.....	31
4.1.1	Data Collection Design	31
4.1.2	Data Analysis Design.....	32
4.2	Population and Sample	33
4.3	Instrumentation and Measurements	34
4.4	Items Table.....	38
4.4.1	Demographic Questions	39
4.5	Ethics Consideration	47
4.6	Data Collection Procedure	47
4.7	Data Analysis Process.....	48
4.7.1	Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	48
4.7.2	Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modelling	49
4.7.3	The PLS-SEM Algorithm	55
4.7.4	Evaluation of PLS-SEM Results.....	56
4.8	Chapter Summary	64
Chapter 5:	Results	66
5.1	Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Variables.....	66
5.1.1	Gender Identity.....	66
5.1.2	Biological Age	68
5.1.3	Technological Age	69
5.1.4	Provenance of Students	70
5.1.5	Current Education	71
5.1.6	TRI Taxonomy	73
5.2	Stage 1 Measurement Model	74

5.2.1	Reliability and Validity	74
5.3	Stage 2 Disjoint Approach	81
5.3.1	Measurement Model	81
5.3.2	Statistical Significance	83
5.4	Chapter Summary	86
Chapter 6:	Discussion, Implication and Conclusion.....	88
6.1	Revisiting the Research's Aim and Objectives, Research Questions, and Hypotheses	88
6.1.1	Aim: Confirm that an individual's technological beliefs have an effect on an individual's learning capabilities and their learning behaviour.	88
6.1.2	Objective 1: Provide empirical evidence.	89
6.1.3	Objective 2: Determine which factor has an effect e.g. which TR dimension affects individual ACAP and learning behaviour.....	89
6.1.4	Objective 3: Provide a model to build instruments.....	89
6.1.5	Research Question.....	89
6.1.6	Hypotheses Results	90
6.1.7	Conclusion	93
6.2	Discussion on Research Findings	93
6.3	Contribution and Implications of the Results	96
6.3.1	Theoretical Implications.....	96
6.3.2	Practical Implications.....	97
6.4	Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research.....	98
6.4.1	Demographic Bias.....	98
6.4.2	Self-Reporting Bias.....	99
6.4.3	Social Network is an Ambiguous Term	99
6.4.4	An Organisation is Not Only the Sum of its Individuals	100
6.4.5	The Truth in Absorptive Capacity.....	100
6.4.6	ACAP is a Dynamic Capability	100
6.4.7	The Different Versions of ACAP.....	101
6.4.8	PLS-SEM Limitations.....	101
6.4.9	Insecurity, Discomfort, TKS and SI.....	101
6.4.10	Innovation Can Mean Many Different Things.....	102
6.4.11	The IWP Limitation	103
6.4.12	Limitations from Other Research.....	103
6.4.13	Conclusion	103
6.5	Summary.....	103
References	105

Appendix A Survey Items.....	114
------------------------------	-----

Acknowledgement

I dedicate this thesis to my late grandmother Maria Dolmark. She, like many other people, never had the opportunity to study even though her wisdom, love and strength inspired me to pursue knowledge. This work is because of you Nona.

I wish to also thank my father Victor Dolmark. There are many people who are unable to pursue further education. I wouldn't have been able to do this without his continuous and unconditional support.

I would like to thank the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), the teachers, students and friends who supported me whilst writing this thesis, in particular my supervisors Dr Osama Sohaib and Prof. Ghassan Beydoun; my friends at UTS such as Diah Priharsari, Ezwan Shah Abd Majid, and Fatuma Kabuye; the School of Information System Modelling and the Graduate Research School who support and supply students with the resources necessary for them to achieve success; the proof-readers who indicated when this thesis was unreadable; and finally, the admin and other supporting staff who are often forgotten but never-the-less are ever present and helping.

I would not have been able to persist without the support of this community. In these trying times (bush fires, COVID-19, and many other tragic events), I wish to send a message of hope to those who are facing despair. To reach this point, it took a lifelong journey punctuated with struggles. However, there is support and potential. Do not ever let anyone hold you back and stick with those who will stand with you.

List of Publications

Conference Paper

Dolmark, T., Sohaib, O. & Beydon, G. 2019, 'The Effect of Technology Readiness on Individual Absorptive Capacity for Knowledge Transfer', *ISD 2019*, ed. C.B. A.

Siarheyeva, M. Lang, H. Linger, & C. Schneider, Information Systems Development: Information Systems Beyond 2020 (ISD2019 Proceedings), Toulon, France: ISEN Yncréa Méditerranée.

<https://aisel.aisnet.org/isd2014/proceedings2019/ISDMethodologies/17/>

Working Papers

Dolmark, T., Sohaib, O. & Beydon, G. 'The Effect of Tools, Social Networks and Social Influences on Individual Absorptive Capacity toward Learning Behavior in Australian Universities'

Dolmark, T., Sohaib, O. & Beydon, G. 'The Effect of Technology Readiness on Individual Absorptive Capacity toward Learning Behavior in Australian Universities'

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
ACAP	Absorptive CAPacity
PACAP	Potential Absorptive CAPacity
RACAP	Realised Absorptive CAPacity
TR	Technology Readiness
TRI	Technology Readiness Index
TAM	Technology Acceptance Model
TKS	Tools for Knowledge Sources
KMS	Knowledge Management System
LMS	Learning Management System
CMS	Content Management System
SI	Social Influences
SN	Social Networks
IWP	Individual Work Performance
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
PLS	Partial Least Squares
CB	Co-variance Based
UTS	University of Technology Sydney
HC	Higher-order Constructs
HOC	Higher-Order Component
LOC	Lower-Order Components
CR	Composite Reliability
AVE	Average Variance Extract
HTMT	HeteroTrait-MonoTrait
VIF	Variance Inflation Factor
BCa	Bias-Corrected and accelerated
CTA	Confirmatory Tetrad Analysis
IMPA	Importance Performance Map Analysis

Abstract

While hard to define, knowledge is critical for organisational success. Organisations who know this spend a significant amount of resources to manage it. In organisations, there are three common barriers to knowledge transfer which are causal ambiguity, relation between knowledge holder and recipient, and recipient's Absorptive CAPacity (ACAP). Horizontal organizational structures appear to be an effective solution to causal ambiguity and relation between knowledge holder and recipient because they allow knowledge to flow across organisational silos. The recipient's ACAP is defined as a dynamic capability to absorb knowledge. While the content and its context are important for knowledge transfer, technology can also enhance learning.

This study addressed the gap in knowledge by examining the role of Technology Readiness (TR), Tools for Knowledge Sources (TKS), Social Influences (SI) and Social Networks (SN) in an individual's ACAP towards learning behaviour. The research addresses the following research question. What is the effect of an individual's technological belief and use on their capability to absorb knowledge towards their technological learning behaviour?

A research model is proposed to empirically test the relationship between TR and individual's ACAP towards learning behaviour. As beliefs affect behaviour, the TRI measures an individual's propensity towards technology. Other antecedents such as TKS, SI and SN may also have an effect on an individual's ACAP. To assess behaviour under control of an individual the Individual Work Performance (IWP) was adapted towards learning behaviours.

To test the presence of a causal effect, this study applied a quantitative approach to confirm theories. A survey was conducted at the University of Technology Sydney (UTS). An online questionnaire was used to collect data from students. A total of 199 participated in the survey. This questionnaire borrowed items from other academic peer reviewed journals. The data were analysed using the Partial Least Square (PLS)-Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) approach. The PLS approach had many benefits such as being flexible and the use of formative and reflective indicators. A High order Construct (HC) allowed abstraction in the research model. The disjoint two-stage approach enabled further validation of the measurement model in its second stage.

The results generated mixed findings. Among the different hypotheses enumerated, the individual's technological belief in Optimism and Innovation, and the SN had a significantly very weak effect on individual ACAP which in turn had a significantly weak effect on their learning behaviour. This study highlighted the need to assess individual ACAP and learning behaviour.

List of Tables

Table 1. TRI Taxonomy Table.....	16
Table 2. Terms and Definition Table	34
Table 3. Demographic Items	39
Table 4. Online Questionnaire Items	40
Table 5. Gender Identity Count.....	67
Table 6. Other Gender Identities Responses	67
Table 7. Age Range Response Rate Count	68
Table 8. Tech Age Response Rate Count.....	69
Table 9. Student Provenance Count	70
Table 10. Other Responses Count.....	70
Table 11. TR Dimensions Average and Median Response.....	73
Table 12. Stage 1 Reflective Indicator Outer Loadings.....	75
Table 13. Stage 1 Reflective Indicator Construct Reliability and Average Variance Extracted	76
Table 14. Stage 1 Reflective Indicator Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio	76
Table 15. Stage 1 Formative Indicator Statistical Significance	77
Table 16. Stage 1 Collinearity Statistics VIF	79
Table 17. Disjoint Stage 2 Formative Indicator Statistical Significance	81
Table 18. Disjoint Stage 2 Collinearity Statistics VIF	82
Table 19. Path Coefficients Relevance and Statistical Significance.....	83

List of Figures

Figure 1. Zahra and Georges (2002) ACAP framework.....	12
Figure 2. Research Model	27
Figure 3. Research Design Flow Chart	33
Figure 4. Reflective Indicator and Construct Assessment, Outer Loading Relevance Testing (Hair 2017, p.114).....	57
Figure 5. Formative Indicator and Construct Assessment, Outer Loading Relevance Testing (Hair 2017, p.150).....	60
Figure 6. Gender Identity Distribution Pie Chart.....	67
Figure 7. Age Range Count Graph.....	68
Figure 8. Tech Age Range Count Graph.....	69
Figure 9. Student Provenance Distribution Pie Chart	71
Figure 10. Current Education Distribution Pie Chart.....	72
Figure 11. Current Education Count Bar Chart	72
Figure 12. TR Dimensions Average and Median Response Graph	74
Figure 13. Disjoint Stage 2 Construct Effect Model.....	84
Figure 14. Summary of Research Results	90